

## REMARKS

The objection to the specification is respectfully traversed. It is not believed that typing is required. If the objection is repeated, appropriate documentation of this requirement is requested on the record.

Claims 1 to 34, 37, 38 and 42 to 44 have been canceled, claim 35 has been amended and claims 45 to 54 have been added. Claims 35, 36, 39 to 41 and 45 to 54 are now active in this application.

Claims 35 to 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stupian et al. (U.S. 5,543,364). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 35 requires, among other steps, the steps of forming a hydrogen permeable layer onto a surface of said package and then removing the support on said package for said hydrogen permeable membrane to form a vent through said package from said hollow interior region to the exterior of said package through said membrane to form a hydrogen permeable layer over said vent. No such steps are taught or even remotely suggested by Stupian et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 36, 39 to 41 and 45 to 54 depend from claim 35 and therefore define patentably over Stupian et al. for at least the reasons presented above with reference to claim 35.

In addition, claim 36 further limits claim 35 by requiring that the hydrogen permeable layer be a layer of palladium. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claims 39 and 40 further limit claims 37 and 38 by requiring that the device be a gallium arsenide semiconductor. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claim 41 further limits claim 40 by requiring the step of placing the package in an environment where the concentration of hydrogen is less than the concentration of hydrogen in the hollow region. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al.

Claims 45, 47, 49, 51 and 53 further limit claims 35, 36 and 39 to 41 by requiring that the hydrogen permeable layer be formed by plating. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

Claims 46, 48, 50, 52 and 54 further limit claims 35, 36 and 39 to 41 by requiring that the step of removing the support on the package be provided by etching the package. No such combination is taught or suggested by Stupian et al. either alone or in the combination as claimed.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay M. Cantor  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 19,906

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P. O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(301) 424-0355 (Phone)  
(972) 917-5293 (Phone)  
(301) 279-0038 (Fax)